



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,186	08/20/2003	Rita J. Klein	2269-4377.3US (99-1120.03)	5692
24247	7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110				LE, THAO P
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2818	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	KLEIN, RITA J.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/20/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 08/20/03 was filed after the mailing date of the application. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over **claims 1-46 of Patent No. 6693366**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-46 of Patent No. 6693366 includes all limitations that disclosed in claims 1-21 of present application; a semiconductor device structure comprising an oxidation barrier comprising a doped metal or doped metal alloy layer o- deposited by electroless plating or an electroless plating bath for depositing an oxidation barrier comprising at least one metal salt and at least one substance that alters a grain structure of a metal of the at least one metal salt. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the substance that alters a grain structure of a metal would have been a reducing agent in oxidation-reduction reaction during electroless process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 8, 11-12, 14, 18-19, 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Bickford et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,318,803.

Regarding claims 1, 8, 18, Bickford et al. discloses a semiconductor device comprising an oxidation barrier whereas the barrier comprising a doped metal or metal alloy layer co-deposited by electroless plating (abstract) (claim 1), or an electroless plating bath comprising at least one metal salt and at least one substance that alters a grain structure of a metal of the at least one metal salt (abstract) (claim 18). It is noted that it is inherent that the deposited metal formed from the electroless metal plating bath of metal and reducing agent is capable of being an oxidation barrier. Therefore, the deposited metal formed in Bickford et al. can be called as oxidation barrier.

Regarding claims 2, 19, Bickford et al. discloses the doped metal or metal alloy layer comprises at least platinum, palladium, ruthenium (lines 20-22, Col. 11).

Regarding claims 11-12, 14, Bickford et al. discloses wherein co-depositing comprises introducing at least part of substrate into an aqueous metal solution comprising at least one reducing agent and at least one of platinum, ruthenium, and palladium (abstract, lines 20-22, Col. 11).

Regarding claim 21, Bickford et al. discloses the electroless plating bath comprising a complexing agent (Col. 6).

Wright et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,332,646, also discloses a semiconductor device structure similar to Bickford et al. and to what recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 18, and dependent claims 2, 11-12, 14, 19, and 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7, 9-10, 13, 15-16, 17, 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickford et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,318,803.

Regarding Claims 3, 5, 13, 15-16, 20, Bickford et al. fails to disclose the doped metal is boron doped or phosphorus doped or the reducing agents is at least one of dimethylaminoborane, borohydride, and hydrazine. It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art to use reducing agent such as dimethylaminoborane, borohydride, and hydrazine in order to obtain boron doped or phosphorus doped.

Regarding claims 9-10, 17, it is well known in the art that a conductive structure or dielectric layer formed over the oxidation barrier layer is obvious in the semiconductor device structure.

Regarding claims 4, 6-7, Bickford et al. fails to disclose the thickness of the doped metal or doped metal alloy or percent by weight of boron, however, the selection of such parameters such as **energy, concentration, temperature, time, molar fraction, depth, thickness, etc.**, would have been obvious and involve routine optimization which has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. "Normally, it is to be expected that a change in **energy, concentration, temperature, time, molar fraction, depth, thickness, etc.**, or in combination of the parameters would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art ... such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller* 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In re Scherl* 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); *In re Irmscher* 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); *In re Norman* 66

USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

When responding to the office action, Applicants' are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist the examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) day from the day of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see M.P.E.P 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao P. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1785. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7-6).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thao P. Le
Examiner
Art Unit 2818